



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/847,138	05/02/2001	Benoit R. Veillette	US010232 (7790/28)	6568

24737 7590 06/14/2005

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

CRAIG, DWIN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2123

DATE MAILED: 06/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/847,138

Applicant(s)

VEILLETTE, BENOIT R.

Examiner

Dwin M Craig

Art Unit

2123

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 3-22-2005 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-22 are presented for reconsideration in view of Applicant's arguments.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments presented in the 3-22-2005 responses have been fully considered.

The Examiner's response is as follows.

- 2.1 Regarding the Applicant's response to the objection to the specification.

The Examiner thanks the Applicant for amending the specification and the Examiner withdraws the earlier objections to the same.

- 2.2 Regarding the Applicant's response to the Examiner's objection to the drawings.

The Examiner thanks the Applicant for amending the drawings, however, it is noted by the Examiner that the drawings that were submitted are blurry and difficult to read and therefore the Examiner is maintaining the objection to the amended drawings.

- 2.3 Regarding the Applicant's response to the 35 U.S.C. 112 1st paragraph rejections of the claims.

The Examiner thanks the Applicant for clarifying the record through the amended specification and the amended drawings and the Examiner withdraws the earlier 35 U.S.C. 112 1st paragraph rejections of the same.

- 2.4 Regarding the Applicant's response to the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections of claims 1-22.

Applicant argued, *page 14 of 15 of the 3-22-2005 responses*.

"Specifically, as illustrated in Fig. 5 Abboud teaches an apodization circuit 60 that includes delay circuits 102-103, counter 104, multipliers 106, 108, 110, look-up table 112, divider 114 and memory 116. The

Art Unit: 2123

circuit 60 receives the aperture size in transducer element units, a number identifying the transducer element channel to be processed, the focused data for such channel and a channel equalization factor. See Abboud at column 6, lines 11-19. Abboud clearly teaches away from replacing the multipliers in view of the fact that circuit 60 is configurable to a significant extent."

The Examiner respectfully traverses the Applicant's arguments. The Examiner notes that as advances in configurable logic have progressed, specific complex logic circuit modules, like multipliers, are replaced with dedicated core modules embedded in Field Programmable Gate Arrays in order to provide faster performance.

The Examiner notes that the second reference used in the previous 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection does not expressly disclose the use of replacement multipliers and therefore the Examiner is withdrawing the previous art rejections.

Drawings

3. The drawings were received on 3-22-2005. These drawings are unacceptable. The Examiner notes that the submitted drawings have many elements that are unreadable. The Examiner respectfully requests that the Applicant, mail in a clear copy of the amended drawings.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. **Claims 1-22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Gilbert et al.**

U.S. Patent 5,904,652.

Art Unit: 2123

4.1 As regards independent **Claims 1 and 17** the *Gilbert et al.* reference teaches a method for optimization of apodization circuits (**Figures 13 and 14D Col. 14 lines 33-42 and lines 54-58**), replacing multipliers (**Figure 5C Col. 9 lines 35-50**), and replacing a window function (**Figure 7B Col. 10 lines 46-54**).

4.2 As regards dependent **Claims 2-16 and 18-22**, the Applicant is respectfully directed towards the disclosure, more specifically for multipliers (**Col. 8 lines 54-60**), memory devices (**Figure 4B item 40**) and windows (**Figures 11a, 11B, 13, 14A, 14B, 14C, 14D, 15A, 15B and 15C**).

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The Examiner has included a collection of prior art references that are related to Applicant's invention, but are not cited in this Office Action for rejection of Applicant's claims.

5.1 Claims 1-22 have been presented for reconsideration in view of Applicant's arguments. Claims 1-22 have been Examiner and rejected. This Office Action is **Non-Final**.


5.2 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dwain M Craig whose telephone number is (571) 272-3710. The examiner can normally be reached on 10:00 - 6:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leo P Picard can be reached on (571) 272-3749. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2123

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DMC


W. Hansen
Primary Examiner
TC 2100
AU 2123